

**REMARKS**

**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-5 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Nishimura et al. (US 6,583,778).

Claims 6-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishimura et al. in view of Hirakata (US 6,496,172).

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishimura et al. in view of Kim (US 6,342,876).

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicants have amended claims 1, 4-7, and 9 to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-10 are pending for further consideration.

**All Claims Comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, the Office Action alleges that claim 7 recites “the double gate shift pulse generator,” which lacks antecedent basis. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claim 7 to recite “the dual gate start pulse generator.” Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 7 complies with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

**All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 1-5 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Nishimura et al. (US 6,583,778). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Independent claims 1, 4, and 5, as amended, all recite a method of driving a liquid crystal display panel including a gate start pulse wherein “the gate start pulse has the same width as that of the gate signals and is overlapped with a first one of the gate signals.” Similarly, independent 9, as amended, recites an apparatus for driving a liquid crystal display panel including “a gate start pulse generating portion to output a gate start pulse to a gate driver, wherein the gate start pulse has the same width of the gate driver and is overlapped with a first one of the gate signals.”

In contrast to Applicants’ claimed invention, Nishimura et al. discloses, in FIG. 9, consecutive application of gate signals during two horizontal synchronization intervals, wherein a second gate signal of two consecutive gate signals applied to the pre-stage row line (i.e., “p-1” row) overlaps a first gate signal of two consecutive gate signals applied to a gate line (i.e., “p” row). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Nishimura et al. fails to teach or suggest a gate start pulse that “has the same width as that of the gate signals and is overlapped with a first one of the gate signals,” as recited by independent claims 1, 4, and 5, and hence dependent claims 2 and 3, or a gate start pulse that “has the same width of the gate driver and is overlapped with a first one of the gate signals,” as recited by independent claim 9, and hence dependent claim 10.

Claims 6-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishimura et al. in view of Hirakata (US 6,496,172). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 6, as amended, recites an apparatus for driving a liquid crystal display panel including “a dual gate start pulse generator pre-charging the pixel cells prior to charging data signal on the source line.” The Office Action acknowledges that Nishimura et al. “does not specifically teach a dual gate start pulse generator charging the pixel cells prior to the charged data signal to the source line.” Accordingly, the Office Action relies upon Hirakata for allegedly teaching a gate start pulse generator, but acknowledges that Hirakata “does not specifically teach the gate start pulse generator is a dual [gate] start pulse generator.” The Office Action merely concludes that “it would have been obvious to obtain a dual [gate] start pulse generator in order to allow the changed gate signal to be more enabled.” Furthermore, the Office Action alleges that it would have been obvious to “incorporate the dual [gate] start pulse generator as taught by Hirakata in the system of Nishimura in order to minimize a horizontal flicker noise.” Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants respectfully note that MPEP 2143.01 instructs that “[o]bviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, where there is some teaching, suggestion or motivation to do so found in either explicitly or implicitly in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art.” Applicants respectfully assert that the Office Action has not provided proper motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Nishimura et al. with the teachings of Hirakata to achieve the invention of claims 6-8.

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishimura et al. in view of Kim (US 6,342,876). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for at least the following reasons.

The present invention was filed on June 29, 2001, and therefore is governed by 35 U.S.C. § 103(c), as revised on November 29, 1999. The subject matter of Kim and the present invention were, at the time the invention was made, commonly owned by LG.Philips LCD Co., Ltd. of Seoul, Korea. Therefore, the disclosure of Kim can not preclude the patentability of the present invention under 35 U.S.C. § 103(c).

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-10 are neither taught nor suggested by the applied prior art references, whether taken alone or in combination. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a) should be withdrawn because the above-discussed novel combination of features are neither taught nor suggested by any of the applied references.


### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner believe that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS**

By:   
David B. Hardy  
Reg. No. 47,362

Date: February 10, 2004

**Customer No. 09629**  
**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS**  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Telephone: 202-739-3000